Treatise Against The Lutherans

Cardinal Thomas de Vio Cajetan, O.P.

Sonnet 4.6 Translation

A TREATISE

of the Most Reverend Lord,

THOMAS DE VIO, CARDINAL CAJETAN OF ST. SIXTUS,

Against the Lutherans, According to Scripture

On the Sacrifice of the Mass, On Communion, On Confession, On Satisfaction, On the Invocation of the Saints

In the Year 1531

*[Translated by @**ofsaintthomas** on X]*

Sonnet 5 Translation

To Clement VII, Supreme Pontiff

Thomas de Vio Cajetan, Cardinal of St. Sixtus,
wishes him happiness.

You once commanded me, most blessed Father, that, acting as an instructor of your envoy, I should write a response to the objections raised in a little book concerning the Lord's Supper, which asserted that the body and blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist only as in a sign. But since a Lutheran booklet, likewise concerning the Lord's Supper, has very recently been presented to me — one that affirms the true body and blood of Christ to be in the Eucharist, yet denies the sacrifice of the Mass, contrary even to all the schismatic churches — I judged that I ought not to wait for a further command, but should carry out the duty of my office by setting forth the reasons for the error of this new heresy. May the judgment of your apostolic authority, then, receive this small nocturnal labor of mine; and farewell, and be well.

A Treatise of Thomas de Vio Cajetan,

Cardinal of St. Sixtus, on the Sacrifice of the Mass, according to the Holy Scriptures

The Author's Intention. Chapter I.

Our one and only master, the Lord Jesus, in refuting the Sadducees — who among the sacred books accepted only the books of Moses — did so out of the books of Moses themselves, thereby teaching us that, in dealing with heretics, we should refrain from citing testimonies which they do not accept, and should instead employ against them only those sacred witnesses which they do not reject. For this reason, in writing against the heretics who are called Lutherans — who rely solely on the testimonies of the sacred Scriptures — concerning the sacrifice of the Mass, I intend to complete the whole disputation and doctrine from the sacred Scriptures alone. I do this, first, so that they may not boast of having a solid foundation in Scripture for their denial of the sacrifice of the Mass; second, so that the less learned may not suppose that the sacrifice of the Mass is upheld only by the institution of the Church and not by the authority of Scripture; and third, so that those Lutherans who err out of ignorance may have a means of coming to

their senses. But in order that the truth may be made clear to all, I shall first set out in what respects the Lutherans agree with the Catholics and in what respects they differ; then what is found in the sacred Scriptures concerning the sacrifice of the Mass; and finally the objections of the Lutherans will be examined.

The Agreement and Difference between the Lutherans and the Catholics concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass. Chapter II.

The Lutherans agree that the Mass may be called a memorial sacrifice, for this reason: that in memory of the sacrifice offered on the Cross, the true body of Christ, together with the true blood of Christ, is consecrated, venerated, and received, since the Lord said, "Do this in remembrance of me." But they deny two things. The first is that the body or blood of Christ is offered to God; for although they affirm that the true body of Christ is on the altar, they nevertheless deny that this true body of Christ is offered to God. The second is that there is on the altar a victim or sacrifice for the expiation of sins, whether for the living or for the dead. And they base both denials on the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is clearly shown that the single oblation of the body of Christ, made once on the Cross, is sufficient for the sins of

the whole world. And from this they infer that, although the veneration of the body of Christ in memory of the Passion and death of Christ was instituted by Christ, the offering of the body of Christ as a victim for sin is a human invention, contrary to the teachings of sacred Scripture.

On the Institution by Christ that the Eucharist Is Sacrificed. Chapter III.

We Catholics, however, acknowledge that the institution of the sacrifice of the Eucharist is written in the sacred writings. For the Evangelists — Luke especially, in chapter 22, and Paul even more particularly, in 1 Corinthians 11 — relate that, after many actions of the Lord Jesus at the Supper, he commanded, "Do this in remembrance of me." Because these are the words of Jesus Christ, they must be weighed very carefully: the pronoun "this," the verb "do," and the phrase "in remembrance of me." In order to understand what is signified by the pronoun "this," we must examine what precedes it. Now it is related beforehand that Jesus took bread, gave thanks, broke it, gave it, and said: "Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you," or, according to Luke, "which is given." And immediately he added, "Do this in remembrance of me." The pronoun "this," then, since it cannot be fitted to point to some of what precedes while

leaving the rest unindicated, must consequently point to the whole of what has just been related.

The word “do” carries many mysteries. For he did not say, “say this,” but “do this,” so as to signify that what he commands consists not in saying but in doing. And the saying that occurs here does so not for the sake of saying, but for the sake of doing, so that we might understand that the words of consecration are words that effect what they signify. And by adding “in remembrance of me,” he distinguishes “doing” from “commemorating.” Thus, though he might have said “commemorate this,” he in fact signified, by not saying it, “do this in remembrance of me.” The Lord Jesus therefore commands that this — that is, the whole of what has just been related — be done in memory of himself. The act of doing this is therefore commanded with reference to the recollection of the Lord Jesus. And from the fact that under “do this” is comprehended not only the making of the body of Christ, but also the making of the body of Christ as broken or given for us, it is clear that the Lord Jesus commanded: “Make my body, which is broken and given for you.” Now it amounts to the same thing to say “broken and given for you” as to say “immolated for you.” For it is broken or given in no other way than as, on the Cross, it was broken and given — that is, immolated — for us. To make my body,

then, as immolated for you in this sense, is the same as making my body insofar as it is immolated for you.

And in order that you may fully grasp what we are saying, note that if the Lord Jesus had added the phrase "broken and given for you" merely to signify the reality of his own body, it would have been enough for him to say, "which you see in my person," or something of that sort. But far be it from the discourse of the Lord Jesus Christ to be an informal manner of speech, by the removal of which all certainty of speech is destroyed; for it would then wander among endless accidental possibilities. By saying, therefore, "which is broken and given for you," he signifies, in formal speech, "make my body, which is offered for you"; and this same thing — "do" — he commands in remembrance of me. Furthermore, from the fact that to do this in memory of Christ is more than merely making the body of Christ by consecration — since it also involves making the body of Christ as given and broken for us — and is more than merely recalling Christ, since it is the making of the body of Christ that is given and broken for us in the very act of recalling him — and since to be given and broken for us is to be immolated for us (for "given" signifies, in general, "offered," while "broken" signifies, specifically, the manner of offering,

namely by breaking; for he gave himself to God on the Cross, breaking, as it were, his hands, feet, and side for us), it follows that when the Lord Jesus commands, "do this in remembrance of me," what is commanded is "do this in a sacrificial manner in remembrance of me." For to make the body of Christ which is immolated is to make it by immolating, that is, in the manner of immolation. For the body of Christ is made by us only insofar as it is immolated: it is not made by us as immolated unless both acts are fulfilled by the deed — namely, both the making of the body of Christ by consecration, and the making, by immolation, of that which is given and broken for us — with a third element joined to these, namely, that it be done in memory of Jesus Christ.

And note, prudent reader, what was done at the Lord's Supper, so that you may weigh how closely institution corresponds to institution, deed to deed, and immolation to immolation. For the supper of the paschal lamb, instituted in memory of the deliverance from Egypt, consisted precisely in the deed of immolation, so that the supper itself was the immolation of the paschal lamb. Likewise, then, once the sacrifice of the paschal lamb was completed, the Lord Jesus instituted our new Passover — himself, to be immolated — saying, "This is my body, which is given and broken for

you; do this in memory of me." It is as though he had said, by way of substitution: "Just as hitherto you have kept the Passover in memory of the departure from Egypt, so henceforth do this in memory of my immolation." So that, by this very substitution of the new Passover for the old, he might be understood to say: "You used to keep that Passover by immolating it at a common meal; so now do this, immolating it at a common table, in remembrance of me." Thus, from this very substitution of the new Passover for the old, it is signified that when he says, "do this in memory of me," it is to be understood as "do it in a sacrificial manner" — for the old Passover, too, was performed in a sacrificial manner.

That this is indeed the true sense of this command is further attested by the facts related by Paul in 1 Corinthians 10. For Paul there reckons the holy bread and the cup of the blood of Christ among things immolated; he counts our table among altars; and he ranks those who eat and drink from the table of the Lord among those who eat and drink of things immolated. From this it clearly appears, both that the Apostles understood Christ's command, "do this in memory of me," to mean the making of the Eucharist by immolation, and that in the time of the Apostles the Eucharist was, in the Church of Christ, not merely a sacrament but also a sacrifice; and

further, that it is found not only in the usage of the Church and the books of the doctors, but in sacred Scripture itself, that the body and blood of the Lord are immolated. The Apostle's words are these: "Flee from the worship of idols. I speak as to wise men; judge for yourselves what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we, being many, are one body, for we all partake of the one bread. Consider Israel according to the flesh: are not those who eat the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What then do I say — that an idol is anything, or that what is sacrificed to idols is anything? But I say that what the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God, and I do not want you to become partakers with demons. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and of the table of demons." So the Apostle. From these words it clearly appears that the Apostle reckons, among the sacrifices of Israel and the things immolated to demons, the bread which we break and the cup of blessing; that he reckons, among the altar of Israel and the table of demons, the table of the Lord; and that he reckons, among those who eat the sacrifices of the altar of Israel and those who eat what is immolated to demons, those who eat from the table of the Lord and drink from

his cup; and from this reasoning he argues that one cannot be a partaker both of what is immolated to God and of what is immolated to demons. For unless the bread and the cup of Christ were immolated to God, the whole of Paul's argument — built upon things immolated, both to the true God by Israel and to demons by the Gentiles — would collapse. But this testimony, that the bread and cup of Christ were immolated in Paul's time, is so clear that it needs no further clarification from us.

On the Institution by Christ that the Eucharist Is Sacrificed for the Remission of Sins. Chapter IV.

The other point denied by the Lutherans concerning the Mass — namely, that it is a victim offered for the expiation of sins — is easily shown, by proceeding along the same path, to be falsely denied, on the strength of that same command of the Lord Jesus. For in Matthew 26 the Lord Jesus, having taken the cup, said not only, "This is my blood, which is shed for many," but added, "for the remission of sins," and then continued, "do this in remembrance of me." Under the command "do this," then, is comprehended the making, by immolation, of the blood of Christ in the cup — not only insofar as it is poured out, but also insofar as it is poured out for many for the remission of sins. For

the formal wording signifies that, just as the shedding of blood for the remission of sins is itself the bloody victim for our sins, so likewise to make the cup of blood which is poured out for the remission of sins is, in this sense, to immolate the cup of blood insofar as it is poured out for the remission of sins, insofar as it effects the remission of sins. For to be poured out for the remission of sins is to effect the remission of sins, so far as this depends on the act itself, whatever the outcome may be. This, then, is not a human invention, but understanding and obedience to a divine command: both to offer the body and blood of Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine, in memory of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to offer these same things for the expiation of sins — as the custom of all the churches, that best interpreter of the Law, not only of the Latin and Greek churches but of the Armenian, Persian, and all the other churches scattered throughout the world, has always from ancient times understood it to be.

Objections from the Epistle to the Hebrews against the Sacrifice of the Mass. Chapter V.

Against these two points of doctrine the Lutherans rise up, drawing on many statements in the Epistle to the Hebrews, from chapter 7 through chapter 10 inclusive. And against the daily offering

of the Eucharist they argue in three ways. First, from the multiplicity of priests. For in that Epistle a distinction is drawn between Christ, the priest of the New Testament, and the priest of the Old Testament: the former is one alone, while the latter had to be multiplied, since the one is eternal and the other temporal. It is unfitting, then, to maintain that in the New Testament there exists a victim for which the one priest, Christ, does not suffice, but for which priest must succeed priest in unbroken succession — as we see must happen in the sacrifice of the Mass. Second, from the repetition of the offering. For in that same Epistle a difference is drawn between the sacrifice of the Old Testament and that of the New: the former was repeated, both daily by the ordinary priests and yearly by the high priest, whereas the latter is repeated neither daily nor yearly, but was offered once. It is unfitting, then, to affirm that in the New Testament there is a sacrifice which must be repeated often. Third, from the nature of the thing offered. For there, too, a difference is drawn between the sacrifice of the Old Testament and that of the New: that then the priest employed the blood of goats and the like, but now Christ has offered himself once, through his own blood. It is unfitting, then, that Christ, who was offered once, by himself, in a fully sufficient manner, should be offered again by us under the appearance of bread and wine.

Against the other point — namely, that the Eucharist is a victim for sins — they likewise argue in three ways. First, from repetition. For there the repetition of the sacrifices of the Old Testament is attributed to their powerlessness to blot out sin; for had they purged sin, they would have ceased to be offered. And therefore the victim of the New Testament, which takes away sin, is not repeated. It is unfitting, then, to affirm that in the New Testament there is a victim for sins which must be repeated, as the Mass is claimed to be. Second, from the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice: because Christ, by a single offering of himself on the Cross, perfected forever all who come to him. It is therefore an injury to the utterly sufficient victim of Christ, offered for the sins of the whole world, to add another victim for sins in the New Testament. Third, from the abolition of sins. For, as is said there, where there remains no more sin to be expiated, there is no need of a victim for sin; but all sins are abolished by the grace of the New Testament, confirmed by the death of Christ. There is, therefore, no place in the New Testament for another victim for sins.

The Response to the Objections. Chapter VI.

The foundation of the truth, and of understanding the various statements of sacred

Scripture concerning the sacrifice and priesthood of the New Testament, is the unity of the victim — offered once, simply and absolutely, on the Cross, by Christ himself in his own person, and offered, in a qualified sense, daily by that same Christ through his ministers in his Church. Thus in the New Testament there is a bloody victim, and there is also an unbloody victim. We acknowledge as the bloody victim Jesus Christ, offered once upon the altar of the Cross for the sins of the whole world; and we acknowledge as the unbloody victim, instituted by Christ, his body and blood under the appearance of bread and wine, as the passages of Scripture already cited attest. Yet the bloody and the unbloody victim are not two victims, but one; for the reality that constitutes the victim is one and the same reality. The body of Christ on our altar is not other than that body of Christ which was offered on the Cross, nor is the blood of Christ on our altar other than that blood of Christ which was poured out on the Cross. But the manner of immolating this one and the same victim differs: for that first, substantial, and original manner of immolating was bloody, since in his own proper form the body, being broken on the Cross, poured out blood; whereas this daily, external, and accessory manner is unbloody, since it represents, under the appearance of bread and wine, that same Christ who was offered on the Cross, in a sacrificial way.

For this reason the victim of the New Testament, bloody and unbloody, is a single victim as regards the thing offered, though there is a diversity as regards the manner of offering; yet since this manner — namely, immolating in an unbloody way — was not instituted as a manner of immolation in its own right, disparate from the other, but only insofar as it refers back to the bloody victim on the Cross, it follows — as those who are learned and discerning enough to see that where one thing exists only for the sake of another, there is in reality but a single thing, will recognize — that one cannot properly speak of two sacrifices, two victims, or two offerings (call them immolations, or by whatever name you wish), as existing in the New Testament merely on the ground that in it there is a bloody victim, Christ on the Cross, and an unbloody victim, Christ on the altar. Rather, there is a single victim, offered once on the Cross, which perseveres in a sacrificial manner through daily repetition, by the institution of Christ, in the Eucharist. We do not imagine the perseverance of the victim offered on the Cross to exist on our altar as a mere fiction; we hold it, rather, on the basis of the identity of the thing offered on the Cross and on the altar. For from the fact that one and the same body of Christ is that which was offered on the Cross and that which is offered on the altar, it is clear that there is not another victim on the altar and on the Cross, but

that the very victim which was offered once on the Cross perseveres, though in another manner, on the altar, by Christ's own command, "do this in remembrance of me." For if you join these two things together — "do this" and "in memory of me" — you will weigh out that we do one and the same thing now, which was done then, in memory of Christ: that is, that one and the same thing which was then broken and poured out perseveres, under the appearance of bread and wine, in memory of Christ.

Coming down, then, from these considerations to resolve each objection individually: to the first, concerning the unity of the priest, it is said that in the New Testament Christ alone is the priest, and he himself is the priest at our altar. For the ministers, whoever they are, consecrate the body and blood of Christ not in their own persons but in the person of Christ, as the words of consecration attest, and thereby, acting in Christ's place, they offer. For the priest does not say, "this is the body of Christ," but "this is my body," thereby making the body of Christ, under the appearance of bread, in the person of Christ, in accordance with Christ's command, "do this." And as to the inference that it is unfitting to affirm a victim in the New Testament for which Christ alone does not suffice, but for which ministers must succeed one another, the answer is

that it is one thing to affirm a disparate victim requiring a succession of priests, and another to affirm the perseverance of the victim offered on the Cross, requiring a succession of ministers. The first would be unbecoming to the state of the New Testament; the second, however, is entirely fitting to it, namely that that single victim, once offered, should continue perpetually in force.

To the second objection, concerning repetition, it is said that in the New Testament the sacrifice or offering itself is not repeated, but that the single sacrifice, once offered, perseveres in a sacrificial manner; and the repetition occurs in the manner of persevering, not in the thing offered itself. Nor does the very manner that is repeated serve the sacrifice for its own sake, but for the sake of commemorating, in an unbloody way, the offering made on the Cross. That this kind of repetition is not contrary to the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews is attested by the very words of that Epistle, which reason that if the sacrifice of the New Testament were repeated, Christ would have had to suffer often. It is clear, then, that the Epistle speaks of the repetition of the sacrifice itself, not of the repetition of this particular manner instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ. To the third objection, concerning the thing offered, it is said that, granted Christ poured out his own blood once on the Cross

in a most sufficient and abundant manner, it is altogether fitting that this single and utterly sufficient shedding of blood on the Cross should continue, in a sacrificial manner, in the Eucharist.

To the first objection against the Eucharist, insofar as it is affirmed to be a victim for sins, it is granted that, owing to the powerlessness of the victim to blot out sins, repetition of the same victim was ordained under the Old Law. And as to the inference that it is unfitting to affirm, in the New Testament, a victim for sins that must be repeated, this is granted entirely, properly speaking; for the victim is not repeated in the Mass, but that very victim which was offered on the Cross, perpetuated in a sacrificial manner, is called to mind in every Mass. To the second it is said that it should never even enter the minds of the faithful to think that the Mass is celebrated in order to supply some deficiency in the efficacy of the victim offered on the Cross. Rather, it is celebrated as a vehicle of the remission of sins wrought by Christ on the Cross, so that, just as there is no other victim, so it brings no other remission of sins. For just as Christ, through his own blood, entered the heavens, remaining a priest forever to intercede for us (as is written in the same Epistle), so he perseveres with us through the Eucharist, in a sacrificial manner, interceding for us. For just as the sufficiency and supreme efficacy of

the sacrifice on the altar of the Cross does not exclude the perseverance of Christ in heaven in the office of interceding for us, so it does not exclude his perseverance with us, in a sacrificial manner, to intercede for us. For just as Christ's continual intercession for us in heaven does not derogate from the singular intercession of Christ's death, so — indeed, far from it — the perseverance of Christ in a sacrificial manner, interceding for us that we may share in the remission of sins wrought on the altar of the Cross, does not derogate from it either, however much this intercession takes place through a mystery, under the appearance of bread and wine, whereas that intercession in heaven takes place through Christ in his own proper form, the form in which he was crucified. For if there were any room for derogation, it would rather derogate from the singular intercession of his death that, after the intercession of his death, Christ should intercede under his own proper appearance rather than under another; for that former manner of interceding presents itself as, so to speak, a supplement to intercession, whereas this latter manner presents itself as a mode of ceremonial intercession, altogether fitting to our condition.

To the third objection it is said that it must be understood, with due qualification, that our sins are remitted through the death of Christ — namely,

through the death of Christ as applied to us through the sacraments instituted by Christ; for on this point all Christians agree. Now among the sacraments instituted by Christ is reckoned, and indeed is, the sacrament of the Eucharist, instituted by Christ himself in a sacrificial manner, as has been shown from the words of Christ and of Paul. And therefore, if there are any among Christians who, after baptism, still stand in need of the remission of sins, the victim of the Eucharist can benefit them toward that remission, by applying to them the efficacy of Christ's death; but for those who do not stand in need of the remission of sins, it benefits the nourishment of the soul, just as bodily food and drink nourish the body. For the sacrament of the Eucharist, although instituted in a sacrificial manner also for the expiation of sins wrought through the Cross of Christ, to be applied to those who partake of it devoutly, was nevertheless not instituted for this purpose alone, but also for other goods of the soul.

With all these things, then, that are written in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the sacrifice of the Mass, as the Catholic Church, taught by Christ and the Apostles, celebrates it, stands firm. And let this be said with the qualification, admitted throughout, that the statements of that Epistle have here been extended and applied to the victim of the Eucharist.

For I am aware that, according to its genuine sense, the author of that Epistle treats of bloody sacrifices, showing the excellence of the bloody sacrifice offered by Christ in establishing the New Testament, in relation to all the sacrifices of the Old Testament. It seemed good, however, for the sake of the clarity of Catholic truth, to admit this kind of extension, so that no occasion for hesitation might be left on any side. To the glory of God: Rome, the third day of May, 1531.

The Treatise on the Sacrifice of the Mass, published by the Most Reverend Lord Thomas de Vio Cajetan, Cardinal of St. Sixtus. THE END.

Thomas de Vio Cajetan, Cardinal of St. Sixtus:

A Treatise on the Four Errors of the Lutherans

Proem

The stubborn spirit of the Lutherans, most excellent Pope Clement VII, invites me, under the pretext of conscience, to write concerning the communion of the people under both kinds of the Eucharist, and concerning the confession that is not of all sins, and the denial of satisfaction, and likewise the invocation of the saints — not treating these matters absolutely, but only insofar as they depend upon sacred Scripture, since the Lutherans themselves accept the authority of sacred Scripture alone and profess to rely upon it. And although these labors of mine will not profit the obstinate, we nevertheless hope they will prove useful, both to hold others back from imitating them and to console the minds of the faithful. For to see, from sacred Scripture, the falsity of what the heretics — who boast themselves teachers of the holy Gospel — teach, brings no small comfort to the faithful. And although I have written these things on behalf of the Catholic Church, I nonetheless submit them, no less than all my other writings, to the judgment of Your Holiness.

On Communion under Both Kinds. Chapter I.

It is not enough for the Lutherans that they themselves receive communion under both kinds; they cannot be brought to admit that communion under one kind alone is lawful, since, they argue, both from the practice of Christ and from his precept, communion must be received under both kinds. It is therefore necessary to examine both points according to the sacred Scriptures, so that we may show that neither from the force of Christ's practice, nor from the force of his precepts, is it unlawful for the people to receive communion under one kind alone. Once this has been made clear, it will be evident that the people are not bound, by divine law, to communion under both kinds.

Since, then, our Savior, in instituting the sacrament of the Eucharist at the Last Supper, employed this sacrament by communicating the apostles under both kinds (as the evangelists attest), it is inferred from this that the priest ought to give the Eucharist under both kinds and in no other way; for the priest, it is said, ought to give the Eucharist just as Christ gave it. And likewise, they say, we all ought to receive communion just as the apostles received it.

We, however, easily show that the practice of Christ and of the apostles does not have the force of a law requiring that the Eucharist be distributed to the people in the same manner. For if that practice of Christ had the force of law, we would not be bound to observe certain features of that manner of distribution while disregarding others, but would be bound to observe everything in that practice. But it is plain that we are not bound to observe everything in that distribution as made by Christ. We are not, therefore, bound in distributing the Eucharist to observe this one point alone: namely, giving it under both kinds. That we are not bound to observe everything is clear, first, because Christ broke the bread and gave it in broken form, yet it would be absurd to say that the priest is bound to give a broken host. Second, because Christ, in distributing it, did not place the Eucharist into the mouths of the apostles, but said, "Take and eat," yet it would be absurd to say that the priest is bound not to place the Eucharist in the mouth of the communicant, but must instead place it in his hand so that he may communicate himself. Third, because Christ distributed this sacrament to the apostles after supper, yet it would be more than absurd to say that we are bound to receive communion after a meal, and that it is unlawful to give the Eucharist to those who are fasting. Fourth, because Christ gave the Eucharist under the appearance of unleavened

bread, and yet the universal Church holds that it is not unlawful to use the Eucharist in either unleavened or leavened bread. From all these considerations it is clearly evident that the manner of distributing the Eucharist which Christ employed does not have the force of a law requiring that our distribution be carried out in the same manner.

But if someone should contend that in this one particular the distribution of Christ must be imitated — namely, that he gave the Eucharist under both kinds — let him note that Christ gave it under both kinds to the apostles alone, and did not give it in this way to the seventy disciples, nor to the multitude of those who believed in him; so that, if anything at all is to be inferred from this example of Christ, it would rather follow that the Eucharist under both kinds ought to be given only to the successors of the apostles — for nothing more can be inferred from Christ's manner of distribution. It cannot, therefore, be inferred that the Eucharist under both kinds must be given to all Christians. It is clear, then, that from the practice of Christ it cannot be inferred that communion of the people under one kind alone is unlawful. And still less can this be inferred from the practice of the church at Corinth, which Paul mentions in his first epistle to the Corinthians; for the practice of one particular

church does not establish a law for other churches. So much concerning the practice.

We must next examine the precepts of Christ, both those given before the institution of the Eucharist and those promulgated at the institution itself. The first precept, taken from the words of the Lord in John 6, was once appropriated by the Bohemians. For Christ says: "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you will not have life in you." What, they ask, could be clearer? For, they say, he promulgates the necessity of communicating under both kinds in exactly the same manner as he had promulgated the necessity of baptism. For just as he had said of baptism in John 3, "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God," so likewise he says of the Eucharist: "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you will not have life in you."

We, however, say that these words of Christ are not, according to their genuine sense, to be understood of the use of the Eucharist; indeed, they cannot, consistent with the Christian faith, be understood of sacramental food and drink at all. And this is easily shown from the fact that, if they were understood of the Eucharist, the sufficiency of baptism for salvation would be destroyed. For these words carry the same note of necessity regarding

the eating of the flesh and the drinking of the blood of the Son of Man as those other words of the Lord carry regarding the necessity of being born of water and the Spirit. And therefore it plainly follows that, if these words indicate a necessity of receiving the Eucharist, baptism does not suffice for salvation, and it would be necessary, in order for anyone to have life, both to be baptized and to receive the Eucharist. The contrary of this we confess not only in the Creed, professing "one baptism for the remission of sins," but the Lord himself says in the Gospel: "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved." And the apostle Paul says to Titus: "He saved us through the washing of regeneration." Since, then, it amounts to the same thing to assert that those words of Christ in John 6 are to be understood of the food and drink of the sacrament of the Eucharist, and to deny the sufficiency of baptism for salvation, it is clear that those words neither are, nor can be, understood of the food and drink of the Eucharist. And therefore no precept for receiving the Eucharist under both kinds is to be found there. To discuss what the true sense of those words of Christ actually is does not belong to the present undertaking; for it suffices, for the question before us, to know that the Lord is not there speaking literally of sacramental food and drink.

It remains, finally, to examine the precepts of Christ promulgated when he instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist. Examine all the Gospels, and you will find in none of them any precept concerning the Eucharist, except in Luke, immediately after the Eucharist under the appearance of bread: “Do this in remembrance of me.” In Paul the apostle, however, in 1 Corinthians 11, two precepts are read as given by Christ at the institution of the Eucharist. The first, immediately after the Eucharist under the appearance of bread: “Do this in remembrance of me.” The second, immediately after the Eucharist under the appearance of wine, namely: “Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.” If these precepts are considered more closely, they carry with them no command whatsoever concerning communion under both kinds, as becomes clear upon examining each in turn. For the precept given immediately after the appearance of bread, both in Luke and in Paul, clearly refers to the Eucharist under the appearance of bread, as the context itself attests. But the precept, found only in Paul, concerning the imitation of Christ in the Eucharist under the appearance of wine, is quite plainly limited to those occasions on which we drink in remembrance of Christ. So that it is not an absolute precept, but a conditional one: namely, that if we do drink in memory of Christ, we should do what

Christ did. He does not, therefore, command that we drink in his memory, but commands that, as often as we do drink in his memory, we do what he himself did — that is, as often as you make use of the cup of the Eucharist, sacrifice it. For "to drink" plainly signifies the use of the cup, and consequently "to do this," as distinguished from "to drink," signifies to consecrate it. For it is literally commanded that the use of the cup be joined to the sacrifice of the cup. And from the very fact that he did not command a similar joining with respect to the use of the Eucharist under the appearance of bread, he thereby implied that the use of the cup, apart from the sacrifice, would be unlawful, whereas the use under the appearance of bread alone is lawful — as the rite of the Church observes, not reserving the Eucharist under the appearance of drink, but only under the appearance of bread, both for the sick and for those who communicate outside the solemnities of the Mass.

But if someone should argue that this precept, by directly binding the priests, consequently binds the people as well — reasoning that, since it is commanded to those who drink in memory of Christ, "do this," it evidently follows that priests celebrating Mass, who do drink in commemoration of Christ, are commanded, "do this"; and that under "do this" is comprehended also the giving of the

cup to others, since it comprehends everything that Christ did regarding the cup; and that therefore, by this precept, the priest is bound, whenever he himself drinks, to give the cup to others, and consequently others are bound to receive it and drink — let him who uses this argument attend, first of all, to the text of the letter itself, for this sense does not fit the context of the letter. For in the text, "do this" is distinguished from "drink," and thereby the confecting of the sacrament is distinguished from the use of the sacrament; and consequently "do this" is not extended so broadly in this text, but is restricted by the very context to signifying the sacrament itself, as distinguished from the use of the sacrament, precisely because it is distinguished from the use of the cup. Whatever, then, pertains to the use of the cup is here comprehended under "drink"; and whatever pertains to the sacrament itself is comprehended under "do this," according to the natural sense of the context. But it is evident that giving the cup to others pertains to the use of the sacrament, and not to the sacrament itself. It is not, therefore, comprehended in this text, under "do this," that the cup should be given to others. Let him note, further, that the Lutherans would be inconsistent with themselves in arguing this way; for from this same argument it plainly follows that the priest celebrating Mass would be bound to give the cup to all present, if "do this" comprehended

also the giving of the sacrament as Christ gave it — for Christ gave it to all who were present. But it is plain that the Lutherans do not observe this. The Christian people, therefore, are not obliged, by this command of CHRIST, according to the plain and most natural sense of the text, to drink the sacrament of the Eucharist.

And since nowhere in sacred Scripture, except in the passages already cited, is there any command regarding communion in the Eucharist, it is evident that the Christian people are not bound, by any precept of written divine law, to communion under both kinds. It is, then, out of their own will, and not on the authority of Scripture, that they proclaim communion under the appearance of bread alone to be unlawful. And this suffices against the Lutherans, who accept the authority of sacred Scripture alone. So much concerning the communion of the people under one kind alone.

On the Integrity of Confession, with Respect to All Sins. Chapter II.

That one must confess all mortal sins that one has committed is not only denied by the Lutherans to be necessary, but they affirm it to be repugnant to sacred Scripture and altogether impossible; for it is written, “Who understands his failings?”

We, however, say that the confession of all mortal sins is found in the Gospel, and that the statement of the prophet just cited is no obstacle to this. That all sins must be confessed in sacramental confession is made manifest by the very form of administering the sacrament of Penance, handed down by Christ when he instituted this sacrament, in John 20. For Christ says to the apostles: “Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.” In these words Christ grants to the minister of the sacrament the power of two actions: namely, of forgiving or of retaining the sins of whomsoever. And from the very fact that the minister is entrusted with the power of discerning whether the sins of each penitent are to be forgiven or retained, it plainly follows that the minister must — unless he wishes to minister blindly — know whether there is in the penitent some sin to be retained, which is to say, know whether there is in the penitent something impeding forgiveness. For every sin that must be retained impedes the forgiveness of any other sin of the person confessing, since one sin cannot be forgiven while another is retained at the same time. For it is evident that all the mortal sins of a single person are bound together, both as regards their forgiveness and as regards their retention, and this both in relation to God and in relation to the minister of Christ. In relation to God

this is clear from the fact that the one whose sin God forgives is thereby made a friend of God, according to the saying: “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord has not imputed sin”; whereas he whose sin God retains, and who remains in even a single sin, is an enemy of God, guilty, as it were, of all, according to the saying in James 2: “Whoever offends in one point has become guilty of all.” From the fact, then, that both the forgiveness and the retention of all the mortal sins a person has are divine acts, it plainly follows that the forgiveness and retention effected by the minister of Christ must likewise concern not merely some, but all, of the mortal sins of the one confessing; for the minister’s forgiveness and retention must be of such a kind that divine forgiveness accompanies his forgiveness, and divine retention accompanies his retention — otherwise the words of Christ, “Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained,” would not be verified. Now the minister’s forgiveness could not claim for itself the accompaniment of divine forgiveness if it were at odds with divine forgiveness; and it would be at odds with it if, while God forgives all sins or retains all sins, the minister did not likewise forgive all or retain all. But in order for the minister to forgive all or retain all, it is necessary that all be made known to him, unless he is a blind and reckless forgiver or

retainer. And since the sins of the penitent become known to the minister of Christ only through the penitent's own confession, it follows that the one confessing must confess all his mortal sins. See, examine, and weigh carefully, prudent reader, what we have said, and you will conclude that the very form of the institution, as it is written in the Gospel, requires the confession of all sins.

It remains to resolve the objections raised by the Lutherans, by distinguishing confession either as taken absolutely, or as it is a human act. To confess all sins absolutely is to leave no sin unconfessed; whereas to confess all sins insofar as confession is a human act is to confess all those sins whose confession lies within human capacity. Hence, from the fact that no one fully understands his own failings, granted that it is impossible for a person to confess absolutely all his sins, since he leaves unconfessed those of which he is unaware, it does not follow from this that a person cannot, through human confession, confess all his sins; for the integrity of human confession does not comprehend all sins absolutely, but only those that are known and remembered. For to confess sins that are forgotten or unknown lies beyond human capacity. And since it is evident that, under both divine and human law, no action is required of a person that does not lie within that person's power, therefore,

when it is understood from the Gospel that confession of all sins is required for the sacrament of Penance, this is not to be understood of the confession of all sins absolutely, but of the confession of all sins insofar as this lies within human capacity. Which is to say, that the penitent should confess all his sins that are not unknown or forgotten. So much concerning the confession of all sins.

On Satisfaction. Chapter III.

Satisfaction for sins, set down as the third part of Penance, the Lutherans deny: both because, they say, it is not found in sacred Scripture, and because our works are neither meritorious nor satisfactory.

We, however, say that it is found in sacred Scripture that, at times, after the forgiveness of sin, satisfaction for sin is necessary, and that this can be accomplished by our own works. And indeed, that after the forgiveness of sin there sometimes remains a penalty still owed for that sin is attested by the two ways in which God forgives sin. For we read that God sometimes forgives sin both as regards guilt and as regards penalty, as is clear in the case of the thief, to whom he said, “Today you will be with me in Paradise,” and also in the remission of sins that takes place at baptism. For baptismal grace

alone suffices for eternal salvation, provided the one baptized, before he dies, places no new obstacle in the way of the final effect of baptism, which is eternal life. And in remissions of this kind it is plain that there is no need of satisfaction. But we also read that God sometimes forgives sin without remitting the entire penalty due for that sin, as is clear in 2 Kings 12. There we read plainly that, when the prophet Nathan charged David with adultery and murder together, and David said, "I have sinned against the Lord," Nathan replied: "The Lord also has put away your sin; you shall not die; nevertheless, the son who is born to you shall surely die." From this it is clear that God forgave the sin both as to guilt and as to some part of the penalty, but did not forgive it as to David's punishment in the death of his son, nor — as the subsequent narrative in chapter 16 attests — as to his punishment in the public violation of his wives by his own son, nor as to his punishment in suffering evil from his own household; for on account of this sin he suffered at the hands of his son Absalom. All these penalties, indeed, the prophet Nathan announced, on God's part, on account of that sin of David's. From the fact, then, that God sometimes forgives sin, and yet after the forgiveness of the sin the one who sinned still remains to be punished, we clearly learn that God sometimes forgives sin without remitting the entire penalty owed for that

sin. From this, then, arises the necessity of paying off that remainder of the penalty which God did not remit in forgiving the sin.

Now since remainders of penalty of this kind can be paid off in two ways — either by suffering them, or by making satisfaction — and David paid his off by suffering (for he did not inflict on himself the penalties he owed, but God inflicted them upon him) — it remains to show from Scripture that we can pay off such remainders of penalty by making satisfaction. Read in the Gospel, Matthew chapter 3, and you will find John the Baptist preaching two things: the one, "do penance"; the other, "bring forth fruit worthy of penance." That the first of these pertains to the sin itself is shown more clearly by the Greek word, which signifies simply the act of repenting.

But that the second pertains to our own subsequent works of penance, the words themselves attest. For "fruit of penance" denotes a work arising from penance, as from a root or a tree. And from the fact that he does not say, "bring forth fruit worthy of innocence," or "fruit worthy of righteousness," or "fruit worthy of goodness," but "fruit worthy of penance," it is manifest that he speaks formally of fruit worthy of penance — that is, insofar as it is penance — meaning that they should bring forth fruit worthy of the root of interior penance. And it is

plain, from the fact that penance concerns past sins, that fruit worthy of penance is a work that restores those things of which there is repentance — that is, that repairs the things which we regret having omitted or committed. This is what we call making satisfaction for sins, insofar as this comprehends the wiping away of all the evils that remain in the penitent as a result of sin, one of which is the guilt of the remaining penalty due for sin. For if penance did not bear fruit in the restoration of all that was lost through sin, it would in no way extend itself to worthy fruits at all, since by its very nature it demands that what it has begun be brought to completion; and it is clear that a thing is not brought to completion so long as something remains owing on account of sin.

From the authority of sacred Scripture, then, it is established that, at times, after the forgiveness of sin, satisfaction is required, which is accomplished through works that are the fruits worthy of penance.

As for the objection raised concerning our works, that they are neither meritorious nor satisfactory, I consider it unworthy of fresh discussion. For sacred Scripture is full of statements affirming both that our works are not meritorious and that our works are meritorious. And it is plain that these two statements are not in conflict with one another, but mean rather this: that our works,

insofar as they proceed from ourselves, are not meritorious, and consequently not satisfactory either; but that our works, insofar as they proceed from divine grace — preventing, accompanying, and perfecting them — are meritorious, and consequently satisfactory. Both of these truths are stated so clearly in countless passages of Scripture that, to those versed in the sacred writings, they are clearer than the noonday light; and for that reason I pass over them. So much concerning satisfaction.

On the Invocation of the Saints. Chapter IV.

The Lutherans say that the invocation of the saints is not found in Scripture. And although I do not think they mean to speak of the invocation of the holy angels but of holy men, yet, choosing the safer course, I shall set forth briefly first what is found in Scripture concerning the invocation of the holy angels, and then concerning the invocation of holy men.

That the angels intercede for us is clear in Zechariah 1, where the angel says to God: "O Lord of hosts, how long will you not have mercy on Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, with which you have been angry these seventy years?" Also in Matthew 18 the Lord says that the angels plead the cause of the little ones who are held in contempt:

“See that you do not despise one of these little ones; for I say to you that their angels in heaven always behold the face of my Father” — doubtless in order to render patronage to those little ones who are despised.

That the holy angels are to be invoked by us is shown, first of all, in Genesis 32, where Jacob called upon the angel to bless him, saying, “I will not let you go unless you bless me.” Then, in Daniel 7, Daniel says of himself, “I approached one of those who stood by, and asked him the truth of the matter.” Nor is there any doubt that he is speaking of the holy angels who stand in attendance. In Hebrews 1, likewise, it is said of the holy angels that they are all “ministering spirits sent forth to serve, for the sake of those who will inherit salvation.” From the fact that God has arranged to govern us through the mediation of angels — not for his own sake, but for our sake, as heirs of eternal life — it is understood that he has ordained that we should invoke the holy angels as intermediaries between ourselves and God; unless one were prepared to be so foolish as to suppose that, when a prince or a court grants an advocate to a foreigner or a ward, it should at the same time be forbidden that the foreigner or ward invoke the patronage of the advocate thus given.

Leaving aside, then, the invocation of the holy angels as sufficiently manifest according to the sacred Scriptures, let us pass on to the invocation of holy men. We are accustomed to invoke the saints in two ways: either by directly petitioning them — as, "Holy Peter, pray for us" — or by petitioning God through the merits of the saints, as the Church is accustomed to pray in the Canon of the Mass, saying, "through whose merits and prayers grant," and so forth.

We say that the invocation of the saints, in both these ways, is found in sacred Scripture. That the souls of the saints intercede for us is found in Revelation 6: "I saw under the altar the souls of those who had been slain for the word of God; and they cried out with a loud voice, saying: How long, O Lord, holy and true, do you not judge and avenge our blood on those who dwell on the earth?" From the fact that the souls of the saints pray to God against the wicked who dwell on earth, we plainly learn that they pray all the more for the salvation of the elect, inasmuch as the will of the saints is more inclined toward our good than toward our harm. Again, in Luke 16, the Lord revealed to us that the rich man in hell interceded for his brothers still living in this life. From this it was made clear that the holy souls intercede far more for the salvation of their own; for if the rich man, who while in this life

had no concern for the salvation of his brothers, even now, placed in torment, importunately pleads for their salvation, how much more do holy men — whose concern in this life was for the salvation of their brothers, and who, having laid aside the flesh and now made blessed, continue their affection of charity — intercede for the salvation of their brothers.

That the saints are to be invoked by us is found in the text of Matthew 27. For it is written there that many bodies of the saints who had slept arose, and came into the holy city, and appeared to many. From this it is understood that God, after the resurrection of Christ, governs us by instructing us not only through the holy angels but also through holy men. For they did not appear to many in vain, but in order to instruct them concerning the true Messiah and his resurrection. And from the fact that up until that time God had governed us through the holy angels and not through holy men, and then began to govern us through holy men, he thereby suggested that he had adopted new means for the governance of the elect. And unless God had wished to make manifest that, in the order of his governance toward us, holy men had been joined to it by reason of the merit of the Passion and resurrection of Christ, he would have sent angels to Jerusalem to appear to many and to instruct them;

but from the fact that he manifested the resurrection of Christ not only through angels appearing to the women at the tomb, but also through holy men appearing to many in Jerusalem, he suggested that, in matters pertaining to our eternal salvation, he has joined to the ministry of angels the ministry of blessed men. And from this it further follows that, from this very order of divine governance, by which God governs us also through holy men, it is made clear that we ought to have recourse to holy men; otherwise the same absurdity would recur which was shown to follow if we could not invoke the holy angels. For that same appearance attests that holy men have been given as intermediaries between God and ourselves for our benefit. And that we may have recourse to intermediaries given to us by divine appointment is plain from what has already been said. It would be little less absurd if God had arranged to govern us through the mediating intercessions of holy men, as the earlier Scriptures attest, and yet it were not lawful for us to have recourse to our own intercessors.

Finally, that God is to be entreated by us through the merits of the saints is found in Exodus 32, where Moses, in supplicating God, says among other things: “Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, your servants.” For this is nothing other than to entreat God through the merits of Abraham,

Isaac, and Israel. And if you join to this what was declared earlier — namely, that the saints intercede for us — you will plainly infer that it is found in Scripture that we should supplicate God not only through the merits, but also through the prayers, of the saints. And if you further add that it comes to the same thing to pray to God through the merits and prayers of the saints, and to pray to the saints that they may set forth their merits and prayers before God — for the reality is the same, though the manner differs, and in either case it is an invocation of the saints, though in different ways — you will easily judge that the invocation of the saints is, in every respect, handed down by sacred Scripture. And let those who read what has here been set forth bear in mind that it belongs to the unlearned to seek mathematical certainty in matters of morals, and universally in matters of human conduct. Rome, the twenty-fifth day of August, 1531.

Cologne, by Peter Quentell. In the year 1532.